MEDIA STATEMENT

International scientists and leading medical professionals demand urgent cessation and judicial review of Pfizer's covid vaccine products which are argued to be unsafe and ineffective

In a landmark case with global ramifications, filed on March 23rd in the high court of Pretoria, South Africa, International scientists and leading medical professionals have demanded urgent judicial review of Pfizer's mRNA covid vaccine products which are argued to be unsafe and ineffective.

In addition to setting out facts showing an unprecedented rise in vaccine injuries, the papers cite new real-world data analysis which reveals an association with increasing death from both covid and non-covid causes in the vaccinated compared to the unvaccinated. Six month data of Pfizer's own randomised controlled trial revealed an almost 50% increase in death from any cause in the vaccinated (20 deaths) versus the unvaccinated (14 deaths).

Global data is showing alarming signals and correlations between the administration of Pfizer's Covid-19 mRNA vaccine products and an unprecedented rise in serious adverse reactions in patients, including disability, foetal abnormalities, aggressive cancers and death. As the global medical community increasingly becomes aware of the problem, the Freedom Alliance of South Africa (FASA) has taken on the government and the medicines regulator, SAHPRA, to safeguard public health.

FASA has approached the High Court in Pretoria, South Africa, to review and set aside the authorisation of Pfizer's vaccine products on the basis that the authorisation was irrational and unlawful. If successful, this will result in the removal of Pfizer's mRNA vaccines from the domestic market. The case is under the custodianship of Advocate Erin-Dianne Richards, briefed by Daniel Eloff of Hurter Spies. The lawyers explain the significance of the case: "FASA's aim is to subject

the South African regulator's decision to authorise the Pfizer mRNA Covid-19 vaccines to judicial scrutiny. They argue that the regulator's decision was based on flawed and inaccurate trial data analysis presented by a heavily conflicted Pfizer, and that it is therefore legally invalid. Their aim is not only to ensure legal compliance – but to set precedent requiring a higher level of statutory scrutiny in the case of future vaccine authorisations in the interests of public health. Whatever the decision of the Court, this case is important. While it has arguably been possible to suppress and distort facts in the public narrative either for or against the vaccines, that will not be possible before our Courts. This case will see a full ventilation of all relevant facts pertaining to South Africa's authorisation of the Pfizer vaccines."

The Court papers explain that Pfizer was the entity responsible for commercialisation of their vaccine products, and yet SAHPRA relied solely on Pfizer's data, and interpretation thereof, to authorise the vaccines, without having subjected that data any independent checks and balances.

The inherent conflict of interest is startling and, as argues FASA, renders the registration of the Pfizer vaccine products vulnerable to judicial attack on the basis of irrationality – especially when considering the alleged irregularities in the data itself.

As far as FASA is aware this is one of the first judicial reviews of the authorisation of Pfizer's Covid-19 mRNA vaccine products in the world.

The application is supported by eminent medical and scientific professionals and academics from South Africa and abroad, including a neurosurgeon, cardiologist, an mRNA expert, and an expert drug trialist.

"These papers prove that the Comirnaty vaccine cannot, and should never have been, branded as 'safe' and 'effective'", says Dr Herman Edeling, a specialist neurosurgeon with over 40 years of experience, in the founding affidavit. He has extensive experience in medical ethics, general medical science, evidence-based medicine and rational interpretation of clinical studies, scientific and medical articles, and scientific and medical data. Dr Edeling's evidence as an independent expert witness has been accepted by the courts, including the Constitutional Court, in South Africa.

"The applicants set out clear evidence showing that Pfizer's vaccine trial for Comirnaty appears to have been a whitewash – mired by what appears to be substantial data manipulation, data inaccuracies, and inaccurate statements of outcomes." FASA will argue that it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that this was done intentionally to mislead global regulators, like SAHPRA, into granting authorization for Pfizer's vaccine products to the detriment of public health.

Dr Edeling, and the other medical professionals in their supporting affidavits, draw on extensive research data from global state authorities and peer-reviewed medical journals, Pfizer's own data as well as data from the Vaccine Adverse Events Reporting System (VAERS) to argue why the approval of Pfizer's vaccine products must be urgently reviewed. The document includes case studies from 11 South African patients who experienced serious and sometimes deadly adverse effects following administration of the Pfizer vaccine.

"The applicants in this application call on Pfizer to explain their conduct; they call on the South African regulators and Government to hold Pfizer to account and to act in the best interests of

the South African public, and they humbly request this Honourable Court to come to their aid in achieving these calls in the interests of the health of the South African public," says Dr Edeling.

Dr Aseem Malhotra, NHS Trained Consultant Cardiologist, who himself took two doses of the Pfizer vaccine and initially promoted it for high risk groups in the British media, says: "Having critically appraised the literature and the Pfizer trial data, the evidence is unequivocal. For the overwhelming majority of people, the Pfizer covid mRNA vaccine is significantly more harmful than beneficial and likely should never have been approved to be administered to a single human being. It is alarming to me that the local regulators are encouraging the vaccination of young children in the circumstances.

"The rollout of the Pfizer vaccine products should, in my opinion, be halted pending a full investigation into how we got this so very wrong. That is, without question, the responsible and ethical move. I have reviewed the data and conclusions in Dr. Edeling's affidavit. In my expert opinion, the case is factually, medically and scientifically sound. It is highly likely there would have been substantially less deaths and illness in the global population if the vaccine had never been approved in the first place. South Africa's Constitution and its Constitutional jurisprudence has motivated, inspired and led the World. My personal hope is that here, too, the South African judiciary will lead the way toward a global rectification of a serious injustice," says Dr Malhotra.

Notice of this application was filed at the High Court in Pretoria on 23 March 2023. The media will be notified of a date of the hearing.